



Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner contacted applicant's representative on September 30th 2004, concerning the August 2nd 2004 amendment and response, because although applicant had presented a series of arguments, which are supported by applicant's specification, the Amended claims failed to recite the features argued as the inventive novelty over the prior-art. (i.e. the applicant's claims failed to recite that the "planar ferromagnetic core provides a substantial ferrorefraction effect which generates a set of mirror image current wires of the same polarity" The applicant's specification has original support for this feature on page 7 lines 8-22. Applicant also failed to recite that the magnetic field is produced with parallel current wires using "an orthogonal ferrorefraction boundary" The examiner also notes that applicant's claims in the August 2nd 2004 response failed to recite "an orthogonal ferrorefractory effect".

The applicant's representative gave permission to the examiner to perform an examiner's amendment to claims 1-8, 14, and 17-19 in order to correct formal matters, and to ensure that the originally disclosed, novel features argued by applicant were clearly recited in each of applicant's claims. The examiner was also given permission to charge any necessary fees to applicant's deposit account. The attorney also agreed to label figures 7, 8a, 8b, 8c, 9a, 9b, 10a, 10b, 11a, and 11b as prior art., since the figures shown illustrate prior art components which are utilized in combination with applicant's novel open magnet configuration in order to produce a fully functioning MRI system. The examiner was thanked for her time and her assistance, in furthering the application towards allowance. Applicant will submit a new set of formal drawings with the above figures labeled prior art, and correct Figures 1a and 1b according to the official draftsperson's review of 09/30/2004.